

ABM file
February 16, 1967

the very genius of our system which is the dispersal of governmental power.

In this the Illinois legislature is outstanding. I congratulate you for doing a superior job and look confidently to you for continued leadership.

No citizen of the United States can be unmindful of the contributions Illinois has made over the years to the success of the American system of government, and of course the name foremost in this galaxy of statesmen is the one whose birthday anniversary we honor at this time.

Abraham Lincoln once remarked to a friend that his most valuable political training came from service in the Illinois General Assembly. There he learned to respect political organization, to maneuver and compromise on detail without sacrificing principle. Perhaps most important of all he came to honor parliamentary procedure as a great shield of liberty, a protection for the minority—yes, even the minority of one—against vengeful or passionate acts by the majority.

I was invited here of course because the area I represent in the United States House of Representatives is known as the Lincoln District. Much of the same area was in the district Lincoln served in Washington 120 years ago.

His service in Springfield as a legislator, his term in Congress, his campaign for the Senate and his service as President, brings to my mind three of the principles by which he lived.

First, his dedication to individual liberty—the right of free expression.

As Congressman and as President he guarded jealously the right of dissent—even in time of war. He both practiced it and protected it.

As Congressman he brought upon his own head national scorn by criticizing America's role in the war with Mexico which was then in progress. He questioned whether Mexico was guilty of any aggression and put the blame instead on the United States. For it he was editorially labeled a traitor, a second Benedict Arnold.

As President he protected the right of free expression even in the darkest hours of the war. He himself was much abused and vilified by cartoonists, writers and speakers, but he protected nonetheless their right to criticize.

Second, his opposition to slavery.

In the same hall where he had earlier served in the Illinois legislature, he warned that a house divided half slave and half free cannot permanently endure. He predicted it will become all one thing or all the other.

As a candidate for the Senate and later as President he viewed slavery as a moral issue. In this he was unlike most prominent figures of his time, who saw slavery primarily as a property or economic issue. He felt that no one is completely free until all are free.

He defined national defense—a topic of much discussion and much expense these days—in a unique way. He said, "Our defense is the preservation of that spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands everywhere."

This was one more way in which Lincoln expressed his conviction that slavery and freedom are mutually exclusive and cannot long stand side by side.

Third, his willingness to act boldly and with imagination.

He was not tied blindly to past traditions. He said, "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is now, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves."

These three principles seem especially appropriate for today.

In this new time of national testing we are engaged in a strange and disturbing war in distant jungles. Prominent voices criticize the bombing, indeed our whole war policies, and try to portray the United States as a cruel aggressor.

The temptation naturally rises to stifle dissent, and to excoriate those who would speak up with an unpopular view. The temptation must be overcome, because liberty—the right of free expression is really what the warfare is all about. We are in Vietnam to help stop the modern-day forces of slavery.

In the formulation of our policies with Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union and other areas controlled by dictatorship, we will wisely keep in mind Lincoln's dictum that a house divided half slave and half free cannot stand.

The enslavement of people by rulers controlling great military power is a real and present danger to our own freedom.

The effort to prevent the expansion of slavery to the rice paddies of South Vietnam is somewhat akin to Lincoln's attempts to block it from wheat fields of Kansas. He knew that in the struggle against slavery to surrender anywhere—whether it be abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia or the freedom of the city of Berlin—is to invite defeat everywhere. We have learned the bitter lesson of experience that wise compromise with slavery is not possible, whether it is phrased in the compromise of 1850 or the Geneva Convention of 1954.

Our goals and aspirations as a nation which Abraham Lincoln set for us over 100 years ago are the same that the American people recognize today in our relations with other countries. As a people we seek a world free from slavery.

A world in which the personal freedoms essential to the dignity of man are secure.

A world of equal rights and equal opportunities for all men.

That Lincoln is regarded as the greatest of U.S. Presidents because he ended slavery and preserved the Union is proof that he met the test. Because he succeeded, he is remembered and revered by men of both parties, but remembering his words is not enough. We honor most appropriately the memory of Abraham Lincoln in perpetuating his principles. While we preserve monuments associated with his career, let us also preserve his achievements and build on them for an even greater future.

The responsibility is challenging. Conditions today are different than yesterday. The problems of people in urban society are different than on the farm of yesterday. Technology has made the world smaller in many respects today than Illinois was when Lincoln was born. Forces of tyranny are more menacing.

The entire scope of human problems must be restudied in light of changed conditions.

As Lincoln said:

"We must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves."

Fino Introduces Bills To Put Chiropractic and Physical Therapist Treatment Under Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to provide pay-

ment for physical therapist's services and chiropractor's services under medicare.

Each year, millions of Americans, young and old alike, use the services of chiropractors and physical therapists. Many of these people are elderly persons who are otherwise covered by medicare. Many of them are pensioners. They do not have money to spend on virtual medical services which ought to be provided for under the medicare program.

Therefore, I am introducing two bills to put chiropractor's and physical therapist's services under medicare. If Congress passes these bills, many of our senior citizens will be helped greatly.

Futility in Arms Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1967

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, in recent days I have come across additional editorial support for President Johnson's effort to dissuade the Soviets from proceeding with the deployment of an antiballistic missile system.

What the President seeks is a common-sense understanding with Russia to prevent a needless explosion in the cost of the arms race and ultimately to draw a halt to that race.

The New York Times contends this objective is in the interest of both countries and all the world. Across the coast in California, the Sacramento Bee says the President merits the backing of all Americans as he tries to lift from our backs the burden of paying for more nuclear weapons.

Each newspaper makes other telling points in behalf of this move in the pursuit of peace.

I ask that their editorials be made a part of the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 9, 1967]

THE ANTIMISSILE DANGER

President Johnson's effort to persuade the Soviet Union to halt deployment of an antiballistic missile (ABM) system is, in the interest of both countries and all the world. A new nuclear arms race would foreclose disarmament efforts for many years. It would be illusory as a route to security, for any defense system can be penetrated or saturated. In upsetting the stability of the present nuclear balance, it could revive the cold war and heighten the danger of a clash through miscalculation.

Moreover, intensified nuclear rivalry would be even more expensive in human than in financial terms. Its cost—ultimately \$40 billion—would not merely compete with social needs in both countries. It would start civilization moving underground for protection against the overhead nuclear explosions on which ABM defenses rely.

Will Moscow accept the logic of a moratorium? High-level soundings to date have been inconclusive. Soviet officials have indicated a willingness to discuss a "freeze" on ABM deployment, but it is too early to judge whether they are interested in heading off the new arms race altogether. Until now, Russia's new leaders have pursued an ambivalent policy.

Despite friction over Vietnam, Moscow has sought some measure of *détente* with the United States. Agreements recently have been reached on a space pact and commercial aviation. Progress toward a nonproliferation treaty has been substantial. A consular treaty has been negotiated and is now before the United States Senate, where its ratification is of urgent priority. Moscow has exercised restraint both in critical zones, such as Berlin, and in more distant areas, such as Africa, Latin America and the Indian subcontinent. All this has been accompanied by high-level intimations that Moscow now considers China, rather than the United States, its chief threat. Investment needs in agriculture and in consumer goods industries give Moscow added incentive to end the cold war and to transfer resources from military to peaceful pursuits.

At the same time, Moscow has been unable to resist the opportunities to divide the Atlantic world that have arisen as a result of Vietnam and the policies of General de Gaulle. And, despite past American suggestions of a missile freeze and American restraint in deferring production of ABM systems, the Soviet Union has initiated deployment of ABM defenses.

This deployment, so far, seems to be limited. There are quite divergent intelligence interpretations of just what the Soviet Union has done and is doing in this area of activity; but some American officials estimate that Russia has spent \$4-to-\$5 billion on ABM development and deployment to date. The U.S. has spent \$2 billion plus for the Nike X missile defense system.

The facts thus suggest that traditional Soviet defense-mindedness and pressure by Soviet military men have induced Russia's new leadership to initiate some ABM steps. What remains obscure, however, are the decisions that have been made about further deployment. There is little evidence as yet that Moscow is setting out to reverse the strategic balance and achieve nuclear superiority over the U.S., although an effort to come closer to parity cannot be ruled out.

In these circumstances, President Johnson's response to Russia's ABM deployment has been sound. Development of American ABM's is being pursued vigorously, but decisions on production and deployment are being deferred. The long "diplomacy versus deployment" debate in Washington has been resolved in favor of a diplomatic effort for a moratorium.

Meanwhile, the United States is pressing ahead with offensive missiles designed to penetrate or saturate Russia's new antimissile defenses. This approach lets Moscow know that the United States prefers to opt for arms control and *détente* rather than renewed arms competition and cold war.

Should Moscow fail to respond adequately, there will still be plenty of time to study intermediate measures. What is important for Americans now is to support the course of restraint and peace.

[From the Sacramento Bee, Feb. 4, 1967]

INCREASE IN ARMS RACE WOULD BE FUTILE, COSTLY

President Lyndon B. Johnson wisely has initiated an effort to reach a commonsense understanding with Russia to prevent a vast and needless spiraling of the cost of the arms race.

Without some agreement between the two major nuclear powers, there will be increasing pressure within both nations to deploy antiballistic missile systems. The cost of this to the United States would be \$40 billion, according to Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

Such a system would deserve serious consideration, regardless of the cost, if it would increase the security of the United States, but this is the flaw pointed out by McNamara. He says that because of the need in both Russia and the US to maintain a nu-

clear capability sufficient to act as an effective deterrent to any potential enemy, the development of an antiballistic missile system by one nation inevitably would cause the other major nuclear power to develop its own equivalent system. The alternative would be to increase its nuclear weaponry enough to neutralize the defensive effectiveness of the antiballistic system.

The end result would be a fantastic new arms race which would have disastrous side effects and all to no avail. The bill for the balance of terror would skyrocket, but the balance would remain the same.

President Johnson merits the backing of Americans as he seeks to bring about an understanding with the Russians which would lift from their backs the burden of paying for more nuclear weapons simply to keep up with an avoidable arms race spiral.

The thought of \$40 billion being spent needlessly on armament when the war against poverty is increasingly on shortened rations is ridiculous. The rivers and lakes, the very air we breathe, are all becoming polluted, and the nation is short of money to face these essential problems.

The unfilled needs of this great nation are waiting fulfillment. Indeed we must have military security but not \$40 billion of needless and dangerous extravagance in the arms race.

Marine Organisms—Widely Diversified Study—22-Year Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1967

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I have recently had occasion to hear expert viewpoints of an Air Force sponsored monograph which will certainly be hailed as a scientific milestone. This is the first edition of a proposed three-volume monograph which is being published by the U.S. Air Force. It was developed and written by Bruce W. Halstead, M.D., of the World Life Research Institute, Colton, Calif., under a Department of Defense contract. This tremendous and wonderful work, which is the result of over 22 years of effort, is the most comprehensive collection of data in this area of marine biology ever written. The release of the first volume has received overwhelming acclaim and acceptance from world leaders in the field. Because of the unique problems involved in graphically portraying its contents only the very best materials and production techniques available are being used by the U.S. Government Printing Office in its manufacture.

Although the publication is directly concerned with the toxicity of marine organisms in the broadest possible sense, the application of much of the data that is represented has far-reaching implications to such widely diverse subjects as medicine, marine biology, natural history, fisheries, public health, economic development, pharmacology, biochemistry, sport fishing, scuba diving, pharmaceutical, industry and military operations. I was also informed that fish, sponges, jellyfish, sea snakes, corals, worms, starfish, sea urchins, marine turtles, sea cucumbers, marine mammals, et

al., are described from the standpoint of their historical, geographical, pharmacological, nomenclatorial, biological, clinical, therapeutic, preventative, pathological and chemical natures. The work has an exhaustive bibliography with thousands of references covering world literature from 3000 B.C. to the present. Many of them were taken from ancient oriental manuscripts and rare technical publications. There will be over 1,000 illustrations by the finest biological illustrators of Japan and the United States.

I am confident that by the successful completion of this project, which is scheduled for early 1968, the United States will open a new horizon of organic chemistry and marine pharmacology and make a vast contribution to man's understanding of the complex ecological and biochemical aspects of "Inner-Space"—The Sea.

They Must Be Doing Something Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1967

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, L. MENDEL RIVERS, recently answered a series of questions on the military exchange and commissary system for the Exchange and Commissary News.

I think my colleagues will find this article very helpful to them in understanding the military resale system and in appreciating the importance of the exchanges and commissaries to the members of the Armed Forces and their families. They will also find it useful in answering questions from constituents.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that Chairman RIVERS in the accompanying article is addressing himself to the exchange and commissary system as it affects the consumer, the individual service family. It may be that there is room for improvement in the procurement and personnel policies of the system and it may be that the Congress will have to look into this area. I want the Members of the House to know that the committee has not neglected this side of the picture and that we will continue to monitor the operation of the system.

The article, which was prepared by Mr. John Neubauer, the astute managing editor of Exchange and Commissary News, follows:

THEY MUST BE DOING SOMETHING RIGHT—A FRANK DISCUSSION OF THE MILITARY RESALE SYSTEM BY ITS NO. 1 CHAMPION

Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, the powerful Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, recently answered a series of questions put to him by E&C News on major issues concerning exchanges and commissaries. RIVERS, our readers will remember, is the man who said if any commissaries are closed it would be "over my battered body." In this report, provided exclusively to E&C News readers, the chairman speaks frankly